

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner asserts that the Amendment and Response to Office Action filed on January 22, 2007, is not fully responsive to the prior Office action. The Examiner asserts that Applicants failed to indicate which of the newly added claims are readable upon the elected species. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that newly submitted claims 50-54 appear to be drawn to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The Examiner bases this assertion on the allegation that the mounting post and frame included in the base and mirror system, respectively, in the newly submitted claims were never actually/specifically claimed by the original invention. The assertions are traversed.

In the Amendment and Response filed January 22, 2007, Applicants stated that new claim 49 is claim 7 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claims 2 and 5-7. Claim 7 was objected to in the prior Office action, but was deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-7 were properly in the Application pursuant to a Requirement for Restriction. Thus, claim 49, which is an amalgamation of claims 1, 2, and 5-7, is properly in the Application and is properly readable upon elected species A.

Claims 50-54 are also readable on elected species A. The Requirement for Restriction identified species A as related to the reinforcing element depicted by element 30. Element 30 is illustrated in Figures 2 and 8 of the Application.

Claim 50 calls for an exterior vehicle mirror system comprising a base, a frame, a connection, and at least one reinforcing element. The base has a mounting post, and a mounting portion for mounting to a vehicle. The frame has an opening through a portion thereof, and is adapted to support a reflective element. The connection pivotally mounts the frame to the base through the coupling of the post with the opening. The at least one reinforcing element is integrated into one of the base and the frame for bridging the connection and distributing stresses

imposed on the frame through the connection to the base along a stress path coextensive with the at least one reinforcing element.

Claim 50 clearly is readable upon elected species A. Referring to Figures 2 and 8 of the Application, a vehicle mirror system is illustrated comprising a base (16) having a mounting post (82), a frame (18) having an opening (46) therethrough, and a coupling of the post (82) with the opening (46) which pivotally mounts the frame (18) to the base (16). The reinforcing element (30) is illustrated in Figure 8 as integrated into one of the base (16) and the frame (18) for bridging the connection and distributing stresses imposed on the frame (18) through the connection to the base (16) along a stress path coextensive with the reinforcing element (30).

In the Requirement for Restriction, the Examiner identified species A as related specifically to the reinforcing element 30. Reinforcing element 30 is called for in claim 50. Claim 50 reads on elected Species A.

Claims 51-54 add structural detail to the reinforcing element which is also illustrated in Figure 8 relative to the reinforcing element 30. All elements called for in claims 50-54 have been described and/or illustrated in the specification and drawings, and are properly called for in the claims.

If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. RUSE ET AL.

Dated: May 8, 2007

By: /Michael F Kelly/  
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859  
G. Thomas Williams, Reg. No. 42,228  
MCGARRY BAIR PC  
32 Market Avenue SW, Suite 500  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
616-742-3500

G0274058.DOC